

it can be quoted here almost in its entirety: "Venus is not male ('His deawy face'), is not associated with the sea, and does not 'reare,' but rather appears heliacally." Mr. Campbell identifies the "faire Starre" with "Phoebus, the sun, whose home is, as Spenser says elsewhere, 'within the western fome' (*Epithalamion* 283). Phoebus is both male and blond, and rises from the sea."

Of the three reasons for disqualifying Venus, the second and third may be dismissed quickly. Though the planet Venus may not traditionally be associated with the sea, when the sun is viewed rising from the sea, Venus is seen preceding it:

"When Venus appears west of the sun, she rises before him in the morning, and is called the morning-star" (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1771, I, 436, drawing its information from James Ferguson, *Astronomy Explained upon Sir Isaac Newton's Principles*, 1756). As to the planet's heliacal movement, even astronomers described it as rising, as the above quotation shows'

On the other hand, as Mr. Campbell points out, Spenser's use of the masculine pronoun to refer to the "faire Starre" apparently rules out the planet Venus, which seems always to be referred to in the feminine, when its gender is mentioned at all' However, the morning star is also frequently identified with Lucifer, who is masculine. Mark Akenside (*The Pleasures of Imagination*, 1744, I, 148-50) writes,

More lovely than when Lucifer displays  
His beaming forehead through the gates of morn, To  
lead the train of Phoebus and the spring.

Citations in the *OED* (under *Lucifer*) from Chaucer, Wyclif, and Milton reinforce this identification. This is not to say that Spenser had Lucifer in mind, but it does show that there is precedent for using the masculine pronoun to refer to the morning star' It is possible, in fact, that Spenser may have had in mind neither masculine nor feminine but neuter in using *his*, because this pronoun was used frequently to refer neutrally to inanimate objects (e.g., "If the salt have lost his savor"), a practice which seems to have affinity with personification (*OED*, *his*, 3).

The most serious objection to Mr' Campbell's own identification of the "faire Starre" with Phoebus, the sun, lies in the word "messenger": the "faire Starre"

comes as a messenger of the morning and therefore precedes the actual arrival of the sun. In another place in *The Faerie Queene* (1'12.21), Spenser writes of Una's entering

As bright as doth the morning starre appeare Out of  
the East, with flaming locks bedight, To tell that  
dawning day is drawing neare.

Milton, in "Song: On May Morning," writes,

Now the bright morning Star, Day's harbinger,  
Comes dancing from the East.

174

Daalder, Joost 1990. Kyd's "The Spanish Tragedy", III.vi.89-94. 'The Explicator', vol.48, no.3, 175-176.

Reprinted with permission of the Helen Dwight Reid Educational Foundation. Published by Heldref Publications, 1319 18th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036-1802. www.heldref.org. Copyright © (1990).

Archived at Flinders University: dspace.flinders.edu.au

The idea of the morning star preceding the sun is implicit in both these quotations, and more importantly in the passage Mr. Campbell is explicating. This makes it difficult to regard the "faire Starre" as the sun itself.

—EDGAR E DANIELS, *Carmel-by-the-Sea, California*

### Kyd's THE SPANISH TRAGEDY 3.6.89-94

*Hiero.* I haue not seen a wretch so impudent,  
O monstrous times where murders set so light,  
And where the soule that should be shrinde in heauen,  
Solelie delights in interdicted things,  
Still wandering in the thornie passages,  
That intercepts it selfe of hapines.

These lines are here quoted from the sole surviving copy of *The Spanish Tragedy* (1592), now in the British Library (shelf-mark C.34.d.7). They have proved puzzling to modern editors, and a possible "emendation" has been mentioned. I believe, on the contrary, that the lines make perfect sense as they stand, provided we realize that the punctuation marks serve to indicate rhetorical pauses rather than syntactical breaks.

The passage can perhaps defensibly be modernized as follows:

*Hieronimo.* I have not seen a wretch so impudent!  
O monstrous times, where murder's set so light;  
And where the soul that should be shrin'd in heaven  
Solely delights in interdicted things,  
Still wand'ring in the thorny passages  
That intercepts itself of happiness.

In what many would see as the standard edition of our times, that by Philip Edwards (London: Methuen, 1959), line 94 is explained as "presumably 'which prevent it (the soul) from attaining happiness'". Since the construction is so clumsy it is impossible to know whether *intercepts* is a correct or incorrect singular, or a rare plural-form."

A later editor, J. R. Mulryne (London: Benn, 1970), comments: "A more natural construction would arise if 'That' were a misprint for 'And', making 'soul' the subject of 'intercepts'; there are, however, no grounds for emendation."

If there are no grounds for emendation, one wonders how Mulryne wishes us to interpret the connection between line 94 and the remainder of the passage. Does

175

he think that, after all, Edwards is on the right track? Or, if not, why are we not offered an explanation more satisfactory than Edwards's?

Edwards, I am sure, gets the sense wrong in relating "That" to (so it appears) "the thorny passages" in the preceding line. In other words, he looks for an antecedent close to the relative and fails to identify the correct antecedent. Having

done so, he then ignores the fact that "itself" is not identical to "it" (as he suggests) but is more likely to refer to the soul.

Mulryne moves in the right direction, but he does not seem to see that the construction is quite correct and natural, with "That" merely repeating the earlier "that" of line 91, which (like this second "That") is relative to "the soul." It is not necessary to consider the noun "soul" the subject of "intercepts," let alone to contemplate substituting "And" for "That," which is itself an adequate subject in a relative clause. Thus Hieronimo complains of a time when "the soul, which should be enshrined in heaven, solely delights in forbidden things—which, perpetually wandering in the thorny passages here on earth, cuts itself off from the happiness for which it is aiming."

There is no such awkwardness in the construction as Edwards and Mulryne see. As always, Kyd writes coherent and clear English here; and the speech eloquently illustrates Hieronimo's bafflement at human conduct in an age with which he cannot come to terms.

—JOOST DAALDER, *Flinders University of South Australia*

## Shakespeare's ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA

*Lepidus.* What manner o' thing is your crocodile?

*Antony.* It is shap'd, sir, like itself, and it is as broad as it hath breadth. It is just so high as it is, and it moves with its own organs' It lives by that which nourisheth it, and, the elements once out of it, it transmigrates. *Lepidus.* What color is it of?

*Antony.* Of its own color too.

*Lepidus.* 'Tis a strange serpent.

*Antony.* 'Tis so. And the tears of it are wet.

*Caesar.* Will this description satisfy him? (II.vii.42-51)

Ostensibly, Antony's crocodile speech in II.vii of *Antony and Cleopatra* mocks Lepidus, but within this jest lurk a cutting criticism of Caesar and a clue to interpreting Caesar's paraded love for Octavia.

Caesar often declares this love (II.ii.24-25, III.ii.139-41, III.ii.159-61, III.vi.87-88), and even displays it, once with a kiss (III.ii.66) and once with tears: *Enobarbus.* "Will Caesar weep?" *Agrippa.* "He has a cloud in's face" (III.ii.51).<sup>1</sup> Yet the drama presents problems with accepting these signs of love at face value. For example, if Caesar loves Octavia, why does he sacrifice her to his political machinations by marrying her to a man whom he has described as "th' abstract of all faults" (I.iv.9)? When she returns unexpectedly to Rome, why does he initially greet her with hostility (III.vi.40), and complain that her unannounced arrival has "prevented The ostentation of our love, which left unshown Is often left unlov'd" (III.vi.51-53)? Can Caesar love only when prepared for public ceremony? Why, a moment later, does Caesar inform Octavia of Antony's desertion in a manner calculated to wound her feelings (III.vi.64-69)? These incidents cause the audience to question Caesar's devotion. Moreover, crediting Caesar with brotherly affection would skew the brilliant and otherwise consistent contrast Shakespeare builds between Caesar as cold and calculating and Antony as passionate and impulsive.

Perhaps, then, Shakespeare intends the audience to doubt Caesar's signs of love—his declarations, his kiss, and his tears. Words and kisses may, of course, always be doubted, but tears seem to bespeak sincerity, and this may be the underlying reason for Antony's crocodile speech.<sup>2</sup> In its second definition of the term, the *Oxford English Dictionary* states that "the crocodile was fabulously said to weep . . . to allure a man for the purpose of devouring him . . . ; hence many allusions in literature," and notes that Maundeville describes deceitful crocodile tears as early as 1400.2

Shakespeare refers to the crocodile three times, first in *II Henry VI*: "Gloucester's show Beguiles him, as the mournful crocodile With sorrow snares relenting passengers" (III.i.226); next in *Othello*: "If that the earth could teem with womans tears, Each drop she falls, would prove a crocodile" (IV.i.246-247); and last in *Antony and Cleopatra*. In the first two references, Shakespeare obviously associates the crocodile with a hypocritical display of sorrow. In the last, he does not explicitly state the association, but he does emphasize the image of the crocodile's tears by placing it at the end of the description and by making this part of the description the only part that Antony offers of his own accord rather than in response to a question. Inasmuch as both Shakespeare and his audience were apparently well aware of the metaphorical content of this image, it seems improbable that Shakespeare would emphasize the image without intending to remind the audience of hypocritical tears.

Yet Shakespeare not only reminds the audience of hypocritical displays of sorrow, he also directs the association toward Caesar. To accomplish this, Shakespeare keeps Caesar silent in the scene until Antony mentions the crocodile's tears at line 50, then has Caesar break his silence to deliver a line of insignificant content, or which could have been delivered by Enobarbus, Menas, or Pompey, and